Document 28

Filed 04/02/2008

Page 1 of 5

Case 3:07-cv-06015-SI

- 2. The action was removed by defendant the United States of America pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1442(a)(1) and 1444.
- 3. Defendant, the United States has claim against the property that plaintiff seeks to foreclose that is related to IRS liens filed against defendant Elstead for unpaid federal taxes. The United States' interest in property that plaintiff seeks to foreclose is the sole basis for federal jurisdiction, which includes the amount and priority of the IRS liens. The parties agree that the remaining issues in this case, which is limited to whether plaintiff has an right to foreclose on the property, arise under California state law. The parties further agree that those issues predominate over the sole federal question.
- 4. Defendant Elstead further agrees that, while no judgment has been entered in favor of the IRS's tax liens, he is not contesting those tax liabilities in this proceeding.
- 5. In addition, the United States agrees that the IRS liens filed against the real property at issue that are related to defendant Elstead's federal tax liabilities are subordinate to Wachovia's interests in the real property it seeks to foreclose.
- 6. Based on the foregoing, the parties agree that this case should be remanded the Alameda County Superior Court, and any pending motion in this Court should be denied as moot.

STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER Case No. 03:07-cv-6015-SI

predominantly under state law. A district court may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction where "the district court has dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction." See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3); see also Bryant v. Adventist Health System/West, 289 F. 3d 1162, 1169 (9th Cir. 2002) (holding where district court grants judgment on federal claims, district court, pursuant to § 1367(c)(3), may properly decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over remaining state law claims). Further, a district court may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims that "substantially predominate[] over the claim or claims over which the district court has original jurisdiction." See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(2). The Court DECLINES to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state law claims.

Accordingly, the above-titled action is hereby REMANDED to the Superior Court of

STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER Case No. 03:07-cv-6015-SI

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	Case 3:07-cv-06015-SI	Document 28	Filed 04/02/2008	Page 5 of 5
1	California, in and for the County of Alameda, and the Clerk is DIRECTED to transfer forthwith			
2	the instant order, at the following address:			
3	Office of the Clerk			
4	Superior Court of California County of Alameda 1225 Fallon Street			
5	Oakland, CA 94612-4293			
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.			
7	II IS SO ORDERED.			
8				
9		SUSAN	ILLSTON O STATES DISTRICT	
10		ONTILL	DISTRICT	COOKT JODGE
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26 27				
28				
_5	STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER Case No. 03:07-cy-6015-SI			